

THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL

VOLUME VII

JANUARY 1912

NUMBER 4

Editorial

THE LOEB CLASSICAL LIBRARY.

One of the most significant chapters in the recently published *Latin and Greek in American Education* is the letter by James Loeb, the New York banker. In the course of his forcible plea for classical studies in the schools he declares that—

conversation among men, and between men and women, is steadily losing those finer qualities which make an exchange of ideas profitable and uplifting. With the absence of respect for authority, which characterizes the youth of today, we are fast losing that respect for the dignity of our own work which alone can give that work real and lasting value. The foolish attempt to keep abreast of the so-called literature of the day, of those morbid, pseudo-psychological novels, the prying and indelicate memoirs—to say nothing of the even more pernicious products of untutored writers—would be impossible, were the taste of our growing youths and maidens formed by a proper study of Greek and Latin literature, the Bible, and the classics of our own and other languages. The applause bestowed on the decadent drama, the vulgar comedy, the immoral and dirty play would turn into hisses, were the audience better acquainted with the works of Aeschylus and Sophocles.

Mr. Loeb's confession of faith in the value of the ancient literature is now followed by the announcement that through his financial support the publishers, Heinemann in London and Macmillan in New York, will at once begin the publication of a great library of translations of Greek and Latin literature, covering the whole period from the Homeric poems to the fall of Constantinople. The editors are to be T. E. Page, of Charterhouse, and W. H. D. Rouse, of the Perse School, Cambridge. They will be assisted by an advisory board consisting of Capps of Princeton, Croiset of the Institut de France, Crusius of Munich, Diels of Berlin, Frazer of Cambridge, Hale of Chicago, Murray of Oxford, Reinach of the Institut de France, Sandys of Cambridge, and White of Harvard.

With rare exceptions the versions will be in prose. Where

standard English translations are already available, these will be reprinted. A large number of scholars in England and America will be invited to prepare the other translations for the series. The volumes will contain the Greek or Latin text and the translation on opposite pages. The whole of each author is to be given, and a biographical introduction will be included in each set. It is expected that twenty volumes will be issued the first year.

The Loeb library will serve a double purpose; it will furnish to those who are entirely dependent on translation for their use of classical literature versions that are based on the best texts, made by scholars who are specialists in the several fields, and written in idiomatic English. In the case of many of the authors such translations are not now available. Of course for these readers the printing of the Greek and Latin texts will have no value, but another large class of readers will heartily welcome this arrangement. Many who have knowledge enough of Greek and Latin to enable them to use text and translation together with pleasure and profit are quite unable to read the text alone with sufficient accuracy and rapidity to give any satisfaction. Professional men who have dropped their classical studies altogether will be tempted to re-read their college authors, and to extend their reading into a much wider field. There is the more need for a series of this sort in a country where, as here, most of the men and women who study Greek and Latin at all in college drop the work at the close of the Freshman year. If such students are to do anything more with Latin and Greek literature, it will have to be by some such means as this; very few will have time or patience to do it in the really scholarly way.

Whether, as is suggested by an editorial writer in the *Nation* of November 9, the volumes will contain "brief and decisive notes," giving at the foot of the page "the kind of simple information, biographical and other, for which the schoolboy is properly sent to books of reference," is not announced. Such brief notes are certainly desirable; without them many passages will be unintelligible. Of course purely linguistic matters would have no place in such notes.

Mr. Loeb deserves the hearty thanks of classical scholars for making possible this popularizing of the ancient literature, and still more for opening the way for many who have barely reached the threshold of the temple to pass on into at least its outer courts.

LATIN LITERATURE AS RELATED TO ROMAN BIRTH

BY MIRIAM ALLEN DE FORD
The University of Pennsylvania

What do we really mean when we speak of "Roman literature"? Are we to narrow the term to literature produced by those actually born within the compass of the seven hills? The idea is not unbelievable; there are Englishmen still who resent the introduction of Poe and Hawthorne into the company of Shakespeare and Shelley. Urban is urban to them, and provincial, provincial.

Yet if we do so narrow our term, there is hardly anything left to us worth the forming of an estimate. From the six centuries, or a little more, between the First Punic War and the fall of the Western Empire, the names of some eighty authors of one sort or another have come down to us. Omitting dilettante emperors, dryly explanatory scientists, lawyers, unimportant war historians, church writers (who mark the beginning of mediaevalism), and the like, there are left forty-seven names which have some meaning to the ordinary student of Latin literature. Of these forty-seven, just six—about 12 per cent only—were born at Rome. The nativity of the other forty-one may be seen by reference to Tables A and B.

It may thus be observed that what we call Roman literature is, as I have intimated, in reality nearly all provincial—might, in fact, more justly be called Cisalpine Gallic. Italian it certainly is—53 per cent of it originated in Italy exclusive of Rome—but the city herself may well be ashamed of her showing.

It is true that in point of numbers she is second on the list; but a glance at Table C will dispel any illusions which that fact may engender. When it comes to a question of real eminence, of a genius sufficient to gain a place in world statistics, Rome falls to the sorry position of sixth by grace among nine, with exactly the same percentage as has the far-off province of Transalpine Gaul. As a matter of fact, just two great writers, Caesar and Lucretius,¹

¹ There is even a good deal of doubt in the case of Lucretius. But I think his case is sufficiently well established for us to include him in this premise.

TABLE A

[illegible]

[illegible]

were certainly born at Rome, and of these the former was chiefly renowned in another capacity. Here, as before, Cisalpine Gaul easily leads—90 per cent of her writers were possessed of something more than simple talent or accidental fame. Below Rome there

TABLE B

Period	Rome	S. Italy	C. Italy	C. Gaul	T. Gaul	Spain	Gr. Ter.	Asia	Africa	Un-known	Total of Periods
I.....	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	7
II.....	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	3	11 (8)
III.....	1	2	2	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	10
IV.....	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	5 (4)
V.....	0	1	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	2	9 (7)
VI.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3 (2)
VII....	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Total places	6	5	4	10	3	5	2	2	3	7	47 (40 without unknowns)

TABLE C

Period	Rome	S. Italy	C. Italy	C. Gaul	T. Gaul	Spain	Gr. Ter.	Asia	Africa	Un-known	Total of Periods
I.....	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
II.....	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
III.....	0	1	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
IV.....	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	4 (3)
V.....	0	0	1	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
VI.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2 (1)
VII....	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Total..	2	3	3	9	1	4	0	0	2	2	26 (24)
Per-centage	33+	60	75	90	33+	80	0	0	66+	28+	55+ (60 without unknowns)

are only the Greek colonies and Asia, where Greek was the common tongue. (Those of unknown birth are, of course, not included in these estimates.)

A word here as to the tables. So far as possible, I have located the small Italian towns, grouping them as Southern Italy (Sicily to Campagna) and Central Italy (Latium to Umbria). Cisalpine Gaul is, of course, the modern Northern Italy. Where I have

used the names of districts, it has been the present Italian departments, which insure uniformity and have definite connotation for one who knows the country and its characteristics. Tarentum I have classed as Greek, although it was in Southern Italy: Greek was the language of the town even during the empire, and it seems never to have become latinized. In general, I have called towns by their Roman names: some larger cities, such as Bordeaux and Cadiz, I have given in their more familiar form.

Of the unknowns, Cinna was born either in Cisalpine Gaul, or, according to Lawton, in Rome; Calvus was probably, but not certainly, of Roman birth, as was also Marcus Tullius Varro; Athens has, without any degree of proof, been claimed as the birth-place of Aulus Gellius.¹ Since the author of the *Pervigilium Veneris* is unknown (I can find no authority for Pater's *Flavianus*, and presume that he is purely fanciful) his place of birth remains also in darkness; strictly speaking, he should not be admitted here; but the poem is too great a masterpiece to rest unnoticed. Its writer is as truly an individual personality as is any man I have mentioned. It is absolutely impossible to obtain any information as to Petronius and Suetonius: personally, I believe Petronius to have been a Roman by birth, but I have no proof at all in the matter. Niebuhr thinks that he dates as late as Septimius Severus or even the Gordians; but surely his letter to Nero should be sufficient proof of the absurdity of that statement.

Table B needs no comment; but I confess that I feel extremely diffident as to Table C. I have taken as the really great, Ennius, Plautus, Terence, Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Tibullus, Ovid, Livy, Seneca, Lucan, Petronius, Persius, Martial, the Plinys, Quintilian, Tacitus, Juvenal, Apuleius, the author of the *Pervigilium Veneris*, and Ausonius. This is over 55 per cent of the whole; but a closer estimate I dared not make. I myself should confine the very greatest writers to ten—Cicero, Caesar, Lucretius, Catullus, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Livy, Juvenal and Tacitus. But surely Plautus, if not Terence, has as good a right here as Ovid or Livy; and three of my own especial favorites,

¹ The inclusion of these names would not make the least addition to Roman eminence.

Propertius, Apuleius, and the author of the *Pervigilium* are omitted, to say nothing of Petronius and Suetonius. On the whole, Table C as given is safest, though a few explanations must still be made, as to perhaps unseemly *lacunae*.

Livius Andronicus owes his reputation rather to the fact that he is the first known writer in Latin than to any intrinsic merit. Naevius, although the fragments we possess of his work show a singular and haughty majesty, and though it is true that for a time after his death "obliti sunt Romai loquier lingua Latina," does not really belong in the same rank with the powerful and lucid Ennius. Cato was a writer of force and a somewhat narrow dignity; but it is as a writer that we least know him, and that he is least worthy of knowledge. Cornelius Nepos gives us an easily understandable Latin; but he has no great talent. Calvus, the "doctus poeta," we know only through extrinsic mention and criticism; and we can hardly exalt him to the highest rank on the word of his personal friends. The same may be said of Gallus. Suetonius is fascinating and valuable; but he would be the last to claim anything more than the position of a cultured and brilliant gossip of the court. Claudianus, like Livius Andronicus, owes his fame to his position—this time the melancholy one of the last of the pagan authors. If some names perhaps expected are entirely absent—such as Hirtius, Silius Italicus, Eutropius, the authors of the *Bellum civile* and the *Historiae Augustae*—I can only plead, as in all this part of my work, a personal and therefore fallible judgment.

As has been seen, then, the great bulk of the so-called Roman writers were provincials; it is worth our while, however, to discover to what extent they felt themselves citizens of the city or of their native towns; and to what extent also they displayed the characteristics of the locality which gave them birth.

The lapses from the original Greek allusions in Plautus are purely Roman—a reference, for instance, to the Tarpeian Rock, or the Capitoline Jove. Terence, more polished and more impersonal than the "flat-footed" Umbrian, displays such slips much more rarely; an allusion to a Roman law or a gladiatorial combat, perhaps, but nothing more. Certainly there is nothing to call the mind to Carthage.

When we come to the Ciceronian age, matters change. Cicero speaks frequently of Arpinum. Catullus chose most of his friends from among trans-Padines. Varro Atacinus utterly ignored Rome to write of his loved Moselle, as David Gray of the Luggie. Publius Syrus gained his name from his birthplace.

In the Augustan age, Virgil's *Eclogues* give us the country of Lombardy rather than that of the Campagna; and if his alleged epitaph be not spurious, Mantua was his first thought when he lay near death. Horace's Sabine farm is as famous as Cicero's villas; in his allusions to his father, he shows sometimes a feeling almost as filial for his native town. I do not think it only fancy which traces in Tibullus and Propertius a country background not Roman; and the mere fact that so much of Tibullus' scenery especially is rural, points to origin in a village. Ovid, who has told us more about himself than any other of these men, is eager to avow his nativity: "Sulmo mihi patria est." Livy's provincialism was so marked that by it he gained the epithet "Patavinus," just as the elegant Petronius was nicknamed "Arbiter."

When we come to the Spaniards, the subjective feeling of difference from the Romans is still more marked. Seneca not only took an interest in his native Corduba, but sent for and almost adopted his nephew Lucan. Martial even went back to Bibilis, though, to tell the truth, he was bored to death there. To return to Italy, Juvenal (in all probability it was the poet himself) dedicated a tablet at Aquinum. Apuleius' style is unmistakably African; Ausonius is practically a Frenchman in feeling.

Many of these men needed no avowal or profession to proclaim their origin. Plautus, Livy, Juvenal: there is a sort of family likeness in them, which becomes heavy-handed humor in the first, sober conscientiousness in the second, moral indignation in the last. Cornelius Nepos, Persius, the Plinys—they, too, are all Northern Italians, with that touch of rustic stolidity that may reveal itself as painstaking history or science, patient academic satire, or cold impersonality (as in the rather despicable younger Pliny). Propertius and Catullus are "sports," in the botanical sense, as are all poets who die too young: each poured out his life in a tragic passion, wasted on a light and worthless woman; each lived the feverish

days of a debauched high society; and if the possession of perhaps the greatest genius of any recorded here will not excuse Catullus' divergence from type, then let us remember that he was born in the city of Rome.

The three greatest of the Spaniards—Seneca, Lucan, and Martial—might be natives of Madrid today. Trucklers to the high and mighty, boastfully proud, but cowards under pressure, ready to turn state's evidence for an inducement: they represent all the worst traits of Spanish character; but they have, too, the Spaniard's quick wit, his fiery ardor, his perfect urbanity.

The partial explanation of a good deal of the foregoing characterization depends, it is true, on the passing of time. The harsh and rude Latin of Livius Andronicus and Naevius gradually gained polish, until it "o'erleaped itself, and fell on the other" side. Still, it is more than mere coincidence that suddenly brought into prominence in the time of Nero a group of brilliant Spanish writers, who rushed like a meteor through the sky of Latin literature, without predecessors or successors; that gave birth to an entire African school, florid and sonorous, which culminated in the Latin writers of Christianity; that little by little widened the provincial horizon, until after the accession of Augustus not a single writer of Roman birth appears except the insignificant Velleius Paterculus, and after him not one. Even the prolific and indefatigable Cisalpine Gaul—in fact, *all Italy*—becomes silent after Hadrian; and what writing there is is being done in Transalpine Gaul, Asia, and Africa. But, allowing for all the changes in government; the accessions of imperial property, bringing hitherto foreign lands into the empire; external and particularly Greek influences (the "Graeculus esuriens" came in when the Graecus went out); the distractions of civil war: accounting for *everything*, yet the absolute literary poverty of the city of Rome remains pitifully evident.

What was the cause of that poverty? Was Rome incapable of independent literary achievement? Was her genius wholly military and political? That is the common answer: but the fact that two such writers as Caesar and Lucretius sprang from her loins is sufficient proof that Rome could well mother a literary genius. It was not for nothing that the Latin written by these two is the

purest in existence. Was it that she gave her attention to a foreign language and literature to the exclusion and detriment of her own? Hardly that, for the great writers of Greek under the Roman dominion—men like Plutarch and Lucian—were born in Greek countries, ignorant of Latin; and the fashion which arose in the later empire of preferring the older to the newer tongue, so that Marcus Aurelius, for instance wrote almost entirely in Greek, came too late to have any influence on a final result. The true answer lies, I think, in an inspection from another point of view of Table A.

The Roman authors given there are, a dramatist, producing *fabulae togatae* and tragedy of the old school; a writer of treatises; a satirist; two military historians (with apologies to Caesar for the company in which he is thus put); and a didactic poet. Let us turn now to Cisalpine Gaul, the most prolific of the provinces. Here we find, again, a comedian and a minor historian, belonging, like those of Rome, to an early period, when the city was still the great and dominant influence: but then come the finest lyrists of Latin literature; its greatest epic poet; its best elegist; its first constructive historian; two satirists in the later style, one of them the greatest of all; its best scientific writer (so good that I have included him here); and its most polished letter-writer after Cicero.

Here is the crux of the matter. The Roman character was inherently didactic: Cato, Lucilius, Lucretius, felt their convictions heavy upon them and were impelled to proselyte their world. It is the accident of a mighty genius that made of Lucretius' defense of Epicureanism a sublime philosophy expressed in a noble and sometimes an almost godlike form. Even to those who cannot agree with Lucretius' views, his poem has a peculiarly majestic impressiveness; to those few of us who are his disciples, it bears a glory almost of divinity. Didactic, however, it essentially and unalterably is.

There are left only Caesar and Naeivius; for every age and every land has its Velleius Paterculus. Caesar, I think we may grant, would have written well in Choctaw. It is my belief that there was little typically Roman about his genius; that, however, is a matter for consideration and discussion elsewhere. In any event the general inclination of his writing is toward the group just

mentioned; it is necessarily argumentative and didactic from the very character of his subject and the peculiarity of his position at the time. Naevius represents the second impulse of early Latin literature, the tendency toward realistic comedy—for realism, as in the eighteenth century in England and the nineteenth in France, always accompanies a didactic and rationalistic attitude. Yet from another aspect he gives also the key to the decline of the really Roman literature; for nearly all his comedies are translations or adaptations from the Greek.

That Greek impulse, which checked before maturity all the Roman tendencies and adaptabilities; which turned the minds of the Romans toward polish on the one hand, and lyric emotion on the other; which made invectives of the satires, epics of the didactic poems, elegies of the rustic choruses, utterly changed the trend of Roman writing. It was analogous to the forcing of our civilization upon the negroes. The Romans never had a chance to develop their own natural bent, but were forced to adopt instead an alien style and viewpoint.

But, unfortunately, the Roman mind was unbending and hard to change; it was one thing to bring the horse to water, via the Greek colonies of Southern Italy, and quite another thing to make him drink. He hobbled along for a while, and then dropped by the wayside: and the rest of Italy took up his burden.

For, by some strange unlikeness which makes us almost believe in the Trojan legend, the genius of exterior Italy, especially to the north in Cisalpine Gaul, was quite capable of absorbing and incorporating with itself the new hellenized Latin literature which Rome could no longer expound. For a while the two—Rome and the rest of Italy—went side by side; then Cisalpine Gaul, Southern Italy, and even the country around Rome gradually gained upon the mother city; until finally when Spain and Transalpine Gaul and Asia and Africa became capable of taking up the burden and the glory, they found ready for them a full-grown literature, splendidly Italian, but having little in common with Rome itself except its language. The connecting link was the country around the capital, from which came Sallust, Tibullus, Ovid, and Tacitus; but there

is significance in the fact that the glory of Rome is Caesar and Lucretius, that of Cisalpine Gaul, Virgil and Catullus.

There is, of course, another connection: every one of these men lived in Rome, took part in her affairs, knew her thoroughly; some, like Cicero, are vitally connected with her history. But they are nevertheless provincials, who took their literary bent from some obscure parent in Umbria or Apulia.

It may be said, finally, that all this discussion is a curiosity of worthless pedantry; that it leads to nothing and has no practical bearing, since Rome nevertheless was "mistress and mother" of the world, and could claim as her own whatever her children brought to her feet. That is true; and yet there is much in Latin literature, as related to and alienated from Roman life and thought, that can be explained only by this remarkable paradox. As the iron walls of empire fell, and objects could be seen in their nakedness, the real trend of Latin literature after that first frustrated spring became manifest. In such poems as the *Pervigilium Veneris*, in prose like that of Apuleius, we have the forerunners and the faint prophecy of the literature of the Romance countries of today.

CICERO'S POLITICAL SYMPATHIES

BY H. V. CANTER
The University of Illinois

There is no purpose to open here in detail the question of Cicero's career as a public man. That has been amply done, both to his advantage and to his disadvantage, by editors, biographers, and historians. It will be sufficient to follow in a general way the changes in criticism of Cicero as a man and statesman, particularly the change from the extremely unfavorable criticism by German scholars of fifty years ago, and to note some of the more recent discussions which bring us to what is probably not far from a final estimate of his life and character. Even such a limited review as this would scarcely seem justifiable were it not for the fact that Cicero is read every year by a new generation of students, and the further fact that usually only those parts are read—a few of the orations and letters—from which the least favorable view of Cicero is obtained, and from which students, sometimes teachers also, carry away wrong impressions. Added to this is the consideration that the earlier and partial criticism referred to, which went so many years unchallenged, is still felt and occasionally echoed in handbooks on Roman history and literature.

Antique criticism of Cicero as a public man is partly favorable, partly hostile, differing in this respect from the unanimous verdict which proclaimed him as an orator *disertissime Romuli nepotum*. Specially favorable is the estimate of Velleius (2.66) and Quintilian (xii. 1.16). Favorable and yet discriminating are the words of Livy (*Frag. lib. cxx*) given at the conclusion of his account of Cicero's death: "si quis tamen virtutibus vitia pensarit, vir magnus, acer, memorabilis fuit, et in cuius laudes persequendas Cicerone laudatore opus fuerit." Judging from the dearth of instances in which Cicero is mentioned by his contemporaries, one might conclude that his public acts had been such as to cause them

to withhold their admiration. But Cicero's case is not unique. It is possible to cite many instances where an author, for reasons not easily discovered, is either inadequately dealt with or passed unnoticed by the writers of his day. Nor is it surprising that after Cicero's death the political descendants of the parties of Pompey and Caesar should have exerted their efforts to prejudice the memory of the great orator. In later Roman times little concern was exercised about Cicero as a statesman. Coming down to the time of the Renaissance it is apparent that the unbounded admiration felt for Cicero as a stylist (cf. Zielinski, *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte*, Leipzig, 1908) made impossible at that time, and for generations of later scholars, any careful and critical estimate of his personal character and political career. This influence together with the importance attached to Cicero's political and philosophical writings preceding and following the period of the French Revolution paved the way for that blind adulation of Cicero found in the writings of Middleton, Trollope, and Niebuhr, a point of view which today seems as untenable and quite as irritating as the criticism which a little later went to the opposite pole.

It was inevitable, however, that the lavish and indiscriminating homage paid Cicero by these admirers should evoke against him a series of bitter criticisms. These are represented by the extreme views of Drumann and Mommsen, which were directly responsible for the succeeding long period during which Cicero was greatly undervalued not only as a public man but as an author. Drumann's estimate (*Gesch. Roms*, VI, § 112 f.) seems today much more like a caricature than serious criticism. In it Cicero is charged with want of respect for justice and truth, lack of patriotism, selfishness, cowardice, vindictiveness—so many bad qualities that it would seem impossible for him to have possessed a single admirable trait of character. Mommsen (*Roman Hist.*, Bk. V, chap. v) in a pointed and malicious sketch, while taking the pains to adduce scarcely an instance in support of his views pronounces him a "notorious political trimmer," who gave allegiance now to the democrats, at times to Pompey, and at times to the aristocrats, a man who loaned his services as an advocate to every man of influence, without distinction of person or party.

The first significant reaction against the influence of these detractors is observable in the brilliant work of Boissier (*Cicéron et ses amis*, Paris, 1884). In general this author follows the historical method in studying the political phenomena of Cicero's day as against the severely judicial method which would look at facts as simple and unrelated. Not only does he give an estimate of Cicero's character and political acts which later critics have indorsed as admirably just, but he suggests with considerable plausibility that the unfriendly attitude of German critics is due to their isolation in academic pursuits, and that their lack of experience in public affairs has unfitted them for sympathetic review of Cicero's political career. He says (p. 26):

One who has lived a witness to practical affairs, in the midst of the workings of political parties, is better enabled to understand the sacrifices which are demanded of a public man by the exigencies of the moment. On the other hand one is prone to harshness in judgment when he measures such a man's conduct solely by rigid theories formulated in seclusion and untried in actual life.

The very opposite reason, a more intimate knowledge of political life and its exigencies, is made to account for the greater sympathy manifested toward Cicero in England and in France. Boissier is doubtless confirmed in this belief, as to his own country at least, by a truth expressed in a later work (*La conjuration de Catilina*, Paris, 1905), viz., that in the history of no other country is to be found so much that gives illumination to the political situation at Rome in the time of the Republic as is observable in the temper and behavior of the body politic in France. Further, Boissier deprecates the misleading way in which Drumann and Mommsen made microscopic search of Cicero's frank and unguarded correspondence—never intended for publication (cf. *ad. Att.* i. 9.1; i. 16.8)—and accepting the statements found there as indicative of the author's settled political conviction and practice, drew up against him the most serious charges of insincerity, duplicity, and inconsistency.

Perhaps no work has done more to bring about a fairer estimate of Cicero than that of Tyrrell-Purser (*Correspondence of Cicero*, London, 1885). It constitutes easily the most extensive apology

for Cicero that has appeared, and has a special claim on our attention by reason of the authors' long and exhaustive study of Cicero's life and writings. The editing and arranging in chronological sequence of every letter in the collection not only gives an intimate and accurate knowledge of the facts extending over a period of twenty-five years, but puts the editors in a position to draw conclusions far more intelligently than any partial study could do. By means of quotations from the letters, summaries are given of the evidence which, in the judgment of the editors, vindicates Cicero's character and motives at many points where previously misapprehended or deliberately misrepresented. Noteworthy is the evidence presented which defends Cicero in his relations with the democratic faction in his early career, his subsequent attitude toward the Triumvirs, and his choice of sides in the civil war. The first of these constitutes the gravamen of Mommsen's charge, as also that of Beesly (*Catiline, Clodius, and Tiberius*, London, 1878) and of Pretor (*Letters of Cicero to Atticus*, London, 1891). Recently the orations also, those delivered prior to the year 63, have been examined with a view to ascertaining their bearing on Cicero's early political tendencies. Heinze (*Abh. der kgl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissensch.*, Leipzig, 1909) maintains that the speeches up to the time of the consulate present on Cicero's part a firm and constant adhesion to the principles of the moderate optimates. Bardt (*Ber. phil. Wochenschr.*, April, 1910) in a review of Heinze's conclusions seeks to show, however, that in these speeches there is found support of the popular party, notably the speech for the Manilian Law, representing a case undertaken by Cicero in direct sympathy with the popular party and to win the favor of Pompey.

In no small measure the more favorable judgment of Cicero which obtains among German scholars today is due to Aly (*Cicero, sein Leben und seine Schriften*, Berlin, 1891). While admitting Cicero's failures of character Aly condemns the attempt of historians to belittle a great man's life by the bringing forward of petty and irrelevant incidents and allowing these to prejudice the more favorable conclusions which would result if facts were put in their right perspective. These attempts he denounces as revealing, not the scientific spirit of the investigator, but the malicious

curiosity of one seeking material to support a preconceived theory. However, Aly's work is disappointing in certain particulars. It does not give that clear and detailed examination of Cicero's political acts that we should naturally expect. It shows a too obvious attempt to explain his acts as those of a hero rather than to let the letters speak for themselves and lead to whatever conclusion they will. There is no discussion of the legal questions involved in the conviction and execution of the Catiline conspirators. Moreover, the letters to Atticus, the fountain-source for grave charges, are not examined and discussed with necessary fulness. And while it does add to our sympathy for Cicero to say that it was the great misfortune of his life that he ever began a political career, it does not meet political issues that a biographer should stand ready to meet and explain.

Schmidt (*Der Briefwechsel des M. Tullius Cicero*, Leipzig, 1893) regards Boissier's reproach against German scholars as not undeserved, maintaining that there is not only need of a change in criticism, but that as a consequence of larger political experience in Germany evidences of such a change are already at hand. He says (p. 18):

The greater part of his [Cicero's] modern German critics, especially Drumann and Mommsen, in their work resemble pathologists rather than historians. We indulge the hope, however, that, inasmuch as the German people have at least begun to put off the swaddling clothes of political life, the severe and unjust estimates of Cicero which emanated *ex cathedra* in a time of political stagnation will no longer find utterance, especially since in political matters of real importance the last decades have brought about views wholly different from the purely theoretical ones of earlier days. It seems to me necessary, therefore, that from the ban and burden of these old verdicts we again raise ourselves to a just estimate of the great orator and patriot.

The same author says even more emphatically (*Zeitschr. für das Gymnasialwesen*, 1896, p. 84):

In opposition to this [Drumann's view] it is high time for us to give fundamental revision to our entire conception of the personality of Cicero, especially our impression of his career as a statesman in the light of the thorough investigation in his correspondence which has been made and is now being made, to the end that first of all our teachers in the *Gymnasia*, then our entire youth, may have before them an objective likeness of this remarkable man, who not only as an orator and stylist towered above the men of his day, but who in a

time of sensuality and low aims remained true to high moral character, and devoted to certain ideals for which he shed his own blood.

Schmidt's work is a careful examination and arrangement in chronological order of one hundred seventeen letters of the correspondence, covering the years 51-44 B.C., from Cicero's proconsulate in Cilicia to Caesar's murder. At the time of publication it was the author's intention to make a like study of the letters previous to the proconsulate and those written after Caesar's death. But from the part already covered he concludes that writers on Roman history have examined Cicero's correspondence very superficially; that a study of the letters in their proper order and relation shows that Cicero's political acts are not only comprehensible but exhibit definite purpose and plans; that despite weaknesses he held true to his ideal of a constitutional state; that his writings on political science and philosophy are in harmony with his public career far more than is ordinarily conceded, and that these writings are not mere attempts at authorship but the utterances of a man striving toward high ideals and inward peace.

Beebe (*Die Haltung Cicero's beim Ausbruch des Bürgerkrieges*, Zürich, 1900) gives an exhaustive historical-psychological study of Cicero's political movements and choice of sides at the beginning of the civil war. It is just here that his reputation has been most bitterly assailed. Beebe thinks that the truth lies between the views expressed by Drumann and Mommsen and those of Aly and Schmidt. This is practically the conclusion reached by Tyrrell—that Cicero followed Pompey as leader of the Optimates and the one man in whom he saw any hope for a restored republic; that it was the weakness and selfishness of Pompey and his party that made Cicero hesitate to join them, while nothing short of a change in his nature could have made it possible for Cicero in honor to follow Caesar. Beebe's investigation, however, adds nothing essential to the results reached in the clear and convincing examination of the same period by Tyrrell, with which work the author seems unfamiliar, or which, at any rate, is not mentioned. The general conclusions are: that much of Cicero's patriotism was born of the desire to win personal honor and the esteem of his contemporaries; that notwithstanding his self-seeking he strove to serve the

welfare of the state; that we expect much of Cicero and accuse in him much that we readily condone in others who stood on a lower moral level than he; that no statesman of that time or of the present could pass unscathed through such a fiery test as Cicero has made for himself by leaving us in his letters an authentic record of those passing thoughts and mental waverings which reveal a man's weaknesses, however good his intentions and noble his ideals.

In a paper by Ruth E. Messenger (*Cicero's Correspondence as an Evidence of his Political Sympathies*), submitted as a thesis for the A.M. degree at the University of Illinois, June, 1911, an independent examination is made of the entire question of Cicero's public life. The plan of Miss Messenger's work and its conclusions can be given only in a general way. One chapter is devoted to a study of the nature and value of the evidence found in the letters, showing that the evidence is not to be regarded as scientific or organized. A second considers the comparative value of the speeches and letters as evidence, particularly that based on utterances in both upon the same subject. It is shown that the statements contained in the letters are the correct ones (because Cicero is not speaking here as an advocate), except in those cases—and they not infrequent—in which Cicero was self-deceived. Then follows a study of the letters in chronological order with a discussion of every act of political significance therein recorded. The most important conclusion reached is that "Cicero's career was consistently that of a constitutionalist." This position is maintained with vigor and in great detail and as the only rational basis on which may be explained Cicero's relations with Pompey, Caesar, and Octavius.

It is apparent from the number and importance of the investigations passed in review that there has come about a complete reversal of verdict in Cicero's favor, and a more general recognition of the fact that those very qualities which unfitted him to be a successful politician were the ones which fitted him so peculiarly to be a past master in the interpretation and transmission of antique culture and formal refinement.

THE USE OF THE OMEN IN PLAUTUS AND TERENCE

BY SAMUEL GRANT OLIPHANT
Grove City College

We shall consider the omen only in that sense of the term which the Roman regarded as its literal meaning. The early form of the word is attested by Varro to have been *osmen*, which he derives from *os*, *oris*, "the mouth." (See Varro *L.L.* vi. 76—*omen quod ex ore primum elatum est, osmen dictum*, and vii. 97—*osmen, e quo s extritum*.) Festus, 195, agrees with this etymology and explains the term thus: *quod fit ore augurium, quod non avibus aliove modo fit*. To the Roman etymologist the word signified simply an augury from that which was spoken. Such is the usage also of the classical writers, e.g., Livy *Praef.*; Quintilian v. 7, 35; Horace *Odes*, iv. 5, 13; Vergil *Aen.* ii. 190; etc.

The Roman *omen* thus corresponds to the Greek *κληδών* or *φήμη*, the augural function of which was known even in the Homeric times. Thus in σ, 117, the *κληδών* is the auspicious words spoken by the suitors in vss. 112-16. Again in Τ 100 ff., Odysseus prays for a *φήμη* from men or a *τέρας* from Zeus. Zeus thunders and a woman grinding at a mill utters the *φήμη* (vss. 112-19), whereupon the hero rejoices in the *κληδών* (vs. 120) and the thunder. The identity of the *κληδών* and the *φήμη* is established also from Sophocles' *Elect.* 1109 f. and from Herodotus, v. 72.

Pausanias (ix. 11. 7) tells us of the oracle of the *κληδόνες* at Smyrna, and also (vii. 22. 2 f.) of that of Hermes Agoraios at Pharai in Achaia. Those that consulted the latter put their questions to the god and then left the temple with their fingers in their ears. At a certain distance from the shrine they removed these, and the first words they chanced to hear were the reply of the oracle.

We may further identify the popular belief in the *omen* and the *κληδών* with that of the Hebrew in what he so picturesquely termed *Bat Kol*, "the daughter of the voice." Farrar has described this

as "the mysterious power of words to work their own fulfilment as one of the laws of destiny."

We may, then, describe the omen as a "prophecy in miniature." An examination of our collection enables us to make a threefold division.

The majority of the omens in Plautus belong to that class which we may term *tychaic*. These are essentially accidental, fortuitous in nature. They are spoken by chance, without augural intent. One of the finest examples in Latin literature is that in the *Confessiones* of Augustine (viii. 11, 29), in which he tells how after the preaching of Ambrose and the study of Paul had opened his mind to higher thoughts and quickened his seared conscience he chanced to hear an artless child singing the refrain "*Tolle, lege; tolle, lege,*" and how this prompted him to take up the Book and read. He became a new man in consequence of the omen.

An illustrative example is found in *Amph.* 718-22:

SO. Amphitruo speraui ego istam tibi parturam filium
Verum non est puero grauida. AM. Quid igitur?
SO. Insania.

Whereupon Alcumena interrupts:

Equidem sana sum et deos quaeso, ut salua pariam filium:
Verum tu malum magnum habebis, si hic suum officium facit:
Ob istuc omen, ominator, capies quod te condecet.

The instance is interesting and instructive. Consider the personality, the physical condition, and the intense earnestness of Alcumena. She is quick to detect the evil omen that lies in the coarse jest of the unwitting Sosia and straightway strives to avert it by prayer to the gods for that against which the omen was directed and by threatening the *ominator*. The design of the latter act was doubtless to bring the will of him that had uttered the ominous words into harmony and participation with her own in imploring the gods to inhibit the power of the words from working their fulfilment.

Similar is the *omen* of *Most.* 464. Tranio has asked his master whether he has touched the doors of the haunted house. Theopropides asks in reply how he could have knocked without touching

them. Then Tranio says: *Occidisti hercle omnis tuos*—an omen surely ominous enough to warrant his master's imprecation:

Di te deaeque omnis faxint cum istoc omine.

The averting prayer is here blended with the imprecation and formally lost in it.

As the familiar story of Romulus and Remus shows that an *auspicium* can be made void by a later and superior one, so *Cas.* 410 f. shows that the same is true of an omen.

Cur omen mihi

Vituperat?

So asks Olympio, who had slapped Chalinus in the face and sought to justify the act by saying

Quia Iuppiter iussit meus.

Chalinus had returned the compliment with his fists with overwhelming effect,

Quia iussit haec Iuno mea.

He thus vitiated the omen by his superior fisticuffs but also formally by naming a more powerful backer. Lysidamus and Cleostrata, his wife, are the *Iuppiter* and *Iuno* in question, and the hen-pecked husband laments that his house will continue a gynocracy as long as he lives.

Besides the method of averting an omen by an appeal to a higher power to inhibit the self-fulfilling power of the ominous words, the omen may be diverted to another.

In *Merc.* 135, as Acanthio runs up in haste, Charinus, his master, asks *Quod est negoti?* Acanthio replies: *Periimus*. Charinus would divert the evil omen, in part at least, to others:

Principium inimicis dato.

In *Asin.* 38, we have another method of averting or diverting an omen. Libanus, alarmed at his master's mention of the mill, a frequent punishment for refractory slaves, entreats him thus:

Teque obsecro hercle, ut quae locutu's despuas.

This is not the place to consider the supposed potency of human spittle in European folklore, but we may cite as an apposite parallel to this passage the words of Seneca (*Cons. ad Marciam*

ix. 4): *Quis non, si admoneatur, ut cogitet (sc. de exilio, egestate, luctu), tanquam dirum omen respuat et in capita inimicorum abire illa iubeat?* This diversion of the omen to one's enemies may be implied in the entreaty of Libanus. If human spittle is potent enough, as may be inferred from *Capt.* 553, to overcome the malign power of epilepsy, it would not seem irrational to suppose it could overcome and inhibit also the malign power in words of evil omen.

It was so easy unwittingly to speak words that might appear ominous to another that it is not surprising that in some instances a mere injunction, more or less earnest yet more or less conventional also, to speak words of happier import should be deemed sufficient. So in *Asin.* 745 Argyrippus exclaims *Benedicite!* to Leonida and Libanus, the former of whom has just said:

De argento si mater tua sciat, ut sit factum.

Similarly in *Aul.* 787, when Euclio mentions his ill luck, Lyconides replies: *Bono animo's, benedice.* So in *Cas.* 346, when Olympio asks: *Quid si sors aliter quam uoles euenerit?* Lysidamus replies: *Benedice: dis sum fretus, deos sperabimus.* In *Rud.* 337, we have another instance. In reply to Trachalio's greeting, *Salve, Ampe-lisca: Quid agis tu?* she says, *Aetatem haud malam male.* Thereupon he bids her *Melius ominare.*

In *Merc.* 881, Charinus, setting forth from home and country, considers the mention of black clouds, storm-troubled waves, etc., by Eutychus as an omen which it would be impious for him to disregard. He shows us another way to inhibit the power of ominous words, as he changes his plan and pursues another course favored by wind, wave, and sky.

Of all the omens in Plautus the one that would make the strongest appeal to his audience with its love of ribald jest and fescennine fun, is that in *Merc.* 272 ff. It is a good specimen of its kind, but happily, the vulgar *ἀνθεκαστότης* of that age is not reproducible in the best literature of the present.

The tychaic omen is not always an augury of ill in Plautus. In *Epid.* 396, Periphanes asks, *Quid fit?* Apoecides replies, *Di deaque te adiuvant.* The former exclaims, *Omen placet,* and the latter remarks:

Quin omni omnis suppetunt res prosperae.

After Chalinus in the *Casina* has lost at the lots he overhears the plans of Olympio and Lysidamus and, seeing his chance to wrest victory from defeat, exclaims in glee (vss. 509 f.):

Nostra omnis lis est: pulcre praeuortar uiros.

Nostro omine it dies: iam uicti uicimus.

Though the figure here was probably suggested by the imperial *auspices*, the word *omen* was justified as the augury was drawn from that which had been said and heard.

A second class of omens consists of those that we may call *onomastic*, as they are derived from proper names. In these the fortuitous element may or may not be present. Among all branches of the Indo-European folk many names of good omen have been given to children in the fond hope that these names might somehow have the power of working out their fulfilment, that they might prove to be prophecies in miniature of the later fortune or character of the bearer. Ausonius has expressed the notion in one of his *Epigrams* (41, Peiper):

Nam diuinare est, nomen componere, quod sit

Fortunae et morum, uel necis indicium.

A popular proverb expresses it more concisely—

Bonum nomen, bonum omen.

The weight attached to such names is attested by Cicero (*De div.* i. 45, 102) as follows:

In lustranda colonia ab eo, qui eam deduceret, et cum imperator exercitum, censor populum lustraret, bonis nominibus qui hostias ducerent eligeantur. Quod idem in dilectu consules observant, ut primus miles fiat bono nomine.

Cicero has given us the two best-known instances of the onomastic omen in Latin literature. One¹ tells how Paullus drew from the words *Persa periit*, spoken by his little daughter with reference to her pet puppy, a happy omen of his victory at Pydna and the early death of King Perseus.

The other² tells of the huckster crying his figs imported from the Carian town Caunus as M. Crassus was embarking his army at Brundisium. The cry *Cauneas!* was interpreted by the super-

¹ *De div.* i. 46, 103.

² *Ibid.*, ii. 40, 84; cf. Plin. *N.H.* xv. 19, 21, 83.

stitious as *Cave ne eas!* and the disastrous result of the expedition confirmed them in their interpretation.

Plautus gives us a good example of the onomastic omen in *Bacch.* 283 ff.:

Adeon me fuisse fungum ut qui illi crederem,
Quom me ipsum nomen eius Archidemides
Clamaret dempturum esse, siquid crederem?

Nicobulus now interprets the name Archidemides, then pronounced at Rome *Arkidemides*, as signifying "one that embezzles (*demere*) from the money-box (*arca*)," a name that should have been ominous enough to deter him from intrusting his gold to the man that bore it. He reminds us of Scipio's reproach (*vid. Liv. xxviii. 28*) of his soldiers for having followed a *dux abominandi nominis*, Atrius Umber, whose name De Quincey cleverly characterized as "a pleonasm of darkness."

Another good example is found in *Pers.* 623 ff. Here Saturio's daughter, now a pretended Arabian captive, is offered for sale to the greedy *leno* Dordalio. He inquires, *Quid nomen tibi est?* She replies, *Lucridei nomen in patria fuit.* Thereupon Toxilus, who is egging on the prospective purchaser, remarks:

Nomen atque omen quantiuis iamst preti: quin tu hanc emis?

These two passages show us something also of the skill and mastery of detail that Plautus sometimes displays in adapting his Greek originals to a Roman audience. Of course, neither of the names Archidemides or Loucridis¹ would convey to a Greek aught of the notion that the paronomasia of Plautus makes it convey to a Roman. Hence it is clearly demonstrable that the omen is an independent addition in each instance to his sources.

The Greeks, too, were fond of finding such hidden omens in proper names. A familiar instance is that in Aeschylus (*Agam.* 681 ff.) where the chorus wonders who with such aptness, with such prescience of the doom, gave name to Helen, who has proved *ἑλέναυς*, *ἑλάνδρος*, *ἑλέπτολις*, which Browning renders "Ship's hell, Man's hell, City's hell."

In our next two omens in Plautus it is clear that each was a

¹ The name in the Greek original was undoubtedly *Λοκριδῆς* or its dialectic variant *Λουκριδῆς*, "a Locrian woman."

part of the Greek original, as neither would have any point in Latin. One of these is in *Pseud.* 712:

PS. Quis istic est? CA. Charinus. PS. Euge, iam χάριν τούτῳ ποιῶ.

The trickster that gave his name to the play draws a happy omen from the name of Charinus. It is augural of the gratitude (χάρις) that that one will owe him for the furtherance of his schemes. Here the Greek original defied translation into Latin.

Another instance is to be found in *Asin.* 374, where it is loosely termed an *auspicium*. The plan has been adopted that a slave, Leonida, shall personate Saurea, the major-domo, to whom the money for the asses is to be paid. Leonida admonishes Libanus, his fellow-slave and principal in the plot, not to be offended if, while acting the part of Saurea, he should slap him in the face. Libanus has no relish for such treatment and replies:

Hercle uero tu cauebis ne me attingas, si sapis,
Ne hodie malo cum auspicio nomen commutaueris.

What can there be of ominous import in assuming the name Saurea? The only suggestion in the commentators is that made by Colerus in the sixteenth century, that Saurea suggests *Taurea*, a lash of rawhide. This has been discarded for more than three centuries, as the edition of Gronovius was the last to indorse it. The present writer, in a note in *Classical Philology*, V, 503 ff., has contended that this omen was in the Greek original, the *Onagos* of Demophilus, where Saurea would at once suggest σαύρα, "lizard." He has shown that all the lizards of Greece are marked with stripes or spots upon back or sides, or both. Hence the meaning of Libanus is: "Take care not to touch me, lest I make a real saurian of you with the stripes, or spots, I'll give you." He will make him as striped or spotted as a lizard. The paronomastic omen could no more be translated into Latin than could that from the name of Charinus in the *Pseudolus* above. An apposite analogue is found in Herondas iii. 89,

ἀλλ' ἐστὶν ὑδρὸς ποικιλώτερος πολλῶ,

describing the laggard schoolboy after the teacher's floggings.

The third class of omens consists of those that we may call *prophylactic*, as they are spoken to anticipate and forestall possible

evil tychaïc omens. This class consists mainly of more or less stereotyped formulas. The *locus classicus* relative to their observance among the Romans is Cicero *De div.* i. 45, 102:

Neque solum deorum voces Pythagorei observitaverunt, sed etiam hominum quae vocant omina. Quae maiores nostri quia valere censebant, idcirco omnibus rebus agendis: "Quod bonum, faustum, felix, fortunatumque esset" praefabantur, rebusque divinis quae publice fierent, ut "faverent linguis" imperabatur inque feriis imperandis ut "litibus et iurgiis se abstinerent."

According to the received traditions such formulas were in official use in the early days of the kingdom, as at the time of the *contio* after the death of Romulus (Livy, i. 17) and at the proclamation of the plan of Tullus of incorporating the people of Alba Longa with that of Rome (*id.*, i, 28).

To this type belongs the housewarming formula found in *Trin.* 40 f., where Callicles takes possession of the house purchased from Lesbonicus:

Vt nobis haec habitatio
Bona fausta felix fortunataque eueniat.

Eunomia in *Aul.* 147, repeats the formula of good omen frequently used in introducing announcements:

Quod tibi sempiternum salutare sit.

Lyconides in the same play, 787-88, presents another introductory formula:

Quae res tibi et gnatae tuae
Bene feliciterque uortat.

In *Poen.* 16, we have a stated, abbreviated form for introducing edicts, etc.:

Bonum factum esse.

Closely akin to such formulaic omens is the use of euphemistic expressions to avoid mention of a word that would suggest an evil omen. Thus, in *Poen.* 1085, Hanno says *siquid me fuat* to avoid the ill-omened mention of death. This recurs again in the form *siquid eo fuerit*, spoken by Callicles in *Trin.* 157. In 291, below, Philto uses the phrase *ad pluris* instead of *ad mortuos*, to avoid the same evil omen. Such euphemisms are common in Indo-European literature from the vedic times to the present day. They are prophylactic omens.

So rich is Plautus in the lore of omens. His extant works may be said, indeed, to be a thesaurus of such lore, containing as they do twenty-three well-defined examples, representative of all classes and some important sub-classes, indicating various ways in which an omen, if evil, might be averted or diverted, and showing how prevalent was the belief in them. They form an interesting and instructive feature in the technique of his plays and contribute not a little to the element of humor in them. Their use is natural and legitimate, without strain or effort, and with such verisimilitude as to enhance their interest and merit. They are found in thirteen of his extant plays. Four plays—*Asinaria*, *Aulularia*, *Casina*, and *Mercator*—contain three each, and two others—*Poenulus* and *Trinummus*—contain two each. He uses the noun *omen* ten times, the verb *ominari* once, and the derivative *ominator* once.

When we turn from this wealth of mention and allusion in Plautus to the plays of Terence we are at once struck with the extreme paucity of examples in the younger poet. It may almost be said that there are no omens in Terence. In the *favete* of *Andr.* 24 we have a reminiscence of the pontifical formula used as a prophylactic omen.

When later in the same play (vs. 200) Simo, after threatening Davos with the cat and then the mill for life, adds:

Ea lege atque omine, ut, si te inde exemerim, ego pro te molam,

we have the one mention of the word, used rather freely in the sense of "assurance," and the nearest approach to a tychaic omen in his works.

In almost every element of divination and folklore we have noted a similar disproportion of mention and allusion between the two poets. This is but one of numerous indications that in content as in form the language of Plautus is nearer to the life and speech of the common people of that age.

CULTURE AND CULT¹

BY CHARLES H. FORBES
Phillips Academy, Andover

There is a lull in the conflict of the allied forces of modern studies against the classics. For the moment no imminent disturbance threatens the peace of the educational world. We have been beaten on our Hellenic flank and now are marching with our maimed battalions, as proudly as we may, seeking new vantage-ground against the impending assaults of our foes. As a potent, widespread force in our general educational system Greek is doomed. When ultra-conservative English schoolmasters, in convention assembled, recently voted to request the authorities of Oxford and Cambridge to grant the degree of Bachelor of Arts to students who offer no Greek, the last straw was deliberately laid on the camel's back. That back is sure to break. We may decline to acknowledge the fact, but we cannot fail to see it. For one, I can observe no movement of the pendulum toward Athena's town. Its path has changed under the powerful sway of modern magnets. Our classical question is fast resolving itself into a question of Latin alone, and we begin to hear ominous mutterings of "How long, O Lord, how long?" The enemy are hovering on our flanks—*ardentis clipeos atque aera micantia cerno*.

We have an inheritance of strength which will not readily yield to attack, but it may be not amiss to consider our ways and to ponder our bases of security. There is evident a move to change the point of emphasis in our work. In the enthusiasm borrowed from Germany and alien to our nature, our scholars for a generation have lent themselves to a single point of view. "Research" has been the watchword, and the criterion of worth. Attainment in the regions of the unknown has been the *sine qua non* of distinction, of promotion, of authority.

In carefulness, accuracy, diligence, and devotion, we must admit

¹ Read before the Classical Association of New England, April 1, 1911.

that the investigator has shown abundantly the fruits of his sowing, the accomplishments of his creed. His glorification of research has yielded rich results in visible, tangible, measurable form. That he has propagated a race of experts trained in technical skill and in the mastery of abstruse detail is undeniable. "Find something nobody else has found and publish it with solemn assertiveness, or we have no place for you," says the college and university. No doubt this policy has done much good in energizing the profession and in giving it a definite, attainable aim and reward. Has it done so much for the cultivation of mankind? Many a man is laboriously imparting his "something new" who is woefully negligent of much that might be far more worthy of transmission. And he has been petted and patted by his fellows until he fondly supposes that he has general approval. How has he strengthened the hold of the classics on our educational system? Are his purposes directed quite so much toward the rearing of cultivated gentlemen as toward the winning of his fellow-laborer's approval?

Our scientific world has emphasized the importance of facts. "Observe actualities, generalize only on ascertained truth," is its monition. The classical investigator has entered upon this path with zeal and enthusiasm. Well and good, if his facts be worth the labor, his results worth the price. The discoveries of classical philology are in general worth no more than the similar details of any other language of culture, as educational forces. They have little value for non-professional purposes. The dry bones of our favorite language will never quicken the spirit of any man's culture.

Research has its proper field and its proper audience; but at its base should lie a purpose broader than itself. The medical investigator, for example, is aiming at the ultimate protection of an invaluable asset—health. But medical research has not yet enlisted the interest of the many as a means of educational advancement. It is, as it should be, the occupation of what we may term a "cult." Its resultant theories, facts, and teachings alone are acceptable for general information and culture. So with scientific research, and so it must inevitably be with philological investigation. Its minutiae can enlist the interest of the practitioner solely; its broad results may touch the cultured man. So the musician

may revel in the technical ramifications of his art, but a musical public will readily spare him the trouble of an explanation.

We gladly pay the honors due from the ranks to the keen investigator and wise diviner of the new in knowledge. He is our distinction and our peculiar pride, the leader of our professional hosts. His eminence is his by right of conquest. But—and here I wish to be emphatic—the righteous needs of the general student may be as widely sundered from his peculiar triumphs as is the evening from the morning star. What makes knowledge fuller does not inevitably render culture deeper. Here lies a profound error in the unrestrained acclaim of the principle of research work. Bent upon making their professors productive, the authorities have fixed their gaze on no other end than extra-lecture-room accomplishment. The making of a book has been exalted above the making of a man. And the result? Alas! the classrooms have too frequently reflected the books, and the students have too often responded by withdrawing to more hospitable quarters. We may glorify research, but we cannot warm our classrooms with its chill effulgence. It has its proper place in the laboratory and the seminar.

How many of us have wasted hours in German university lecture-rooms! I recall, with pride in my endurance and with horror at my sinfulness, attending ten consecutive lectures on the caesura in the verse of Terence. Ten hours of scribbling what I could have learned in two! I once took a course, ostensibly, in the *Agricola* of Tacitus. The whole semester was consumed in the discussion of the name Tacitus in inscription and literature, most of which had nothing to do with Tacitus, and in other matters that had nothing to do with his work. Of the *Agricola*, not one line was considered! Gründlich? Jawohl, ohne Zweifel sehr gründlich—*aber*, meine Herren, *aber*! Can we expect throngs hungering for such *Wissenschaft* in our colleges?

What then do I mean by "cult"? And what lines of work are dominated by aims ending in cult? Whatever is limited to the peculiar interests of professionals I am classifying as a cult; whatsoever may be shared with and welcomed by intelligent laymen, and will lead to their deeper, wider comprehension of man and man's ideas and art is the parent of what I am terming "culture."

We have our cult of method, our cult of habit, our cult of faith in our subject, just as we have our cult of research. We need to remember that not all things are perpetually good and perpetually valuable. What has contributed to the cultural life of one generation may become a hindrance to the intellectual demands of the next. The measuring-rod of public criticism is constantly applied to our work as it is to that of others. We cannot expect continued acceptance of our beliefs, unless we can show their worth in results. "Faith without works is dead" in the humanities as in religion.

There are many ranges of our secondary-school labors which are controlled by inherited beliefs and tenets of schoolmastership. On all sides we may see emphasis laid on points of view the reason for which would be far to seek, but which inherited habit invests with authority and sanctity. We are practicing a cult when in blind trustfulness we teach that which is a means as if it were an end. The rattle of machinery can never supply the demand for a finished product. Think of the vicissitudes of poor old Caesar! Have we not heard his *gemitus lacrimabilis* *imo tumulto*?

Quid miserum, Aenea, laceras? iam parce sepulto;
parce pias scelerare manus.

The daggers of my foes drank my blood, but the scalpels of my friends exult in the vivisection of my soul. Drop my syntax and lay hold of my sense. Give me half a chance to tell my tale, for I am something more than court-jester to His Highness, the Latin Grammar.

We have few more vivid illustrations of the results of cult than the fatuous confidence with which we assert the stupendous value of Latin composition. The colleges splendidly display the importance of this noble art by setting two examinations in it, an elementary and (save the word!) an advanced examination. We are assured in the *praecepta* of catalogues that the writing of Latin is of vital importance to the comprehension of the printed page. What then becomes of this beneficent adjunct to understanding in our colleges? How many insist on prose composition along with the literature? Is the question impertinent or only irrelevant? Is, then, the passing of an "advanced" examination for entrance the certificate of perfection in this form of training? This is not jeering, but dead earnest. Must students forever be forced through

the underbrush, knowing that they will never be led into the open fields? Treat the subject seriously, or make it elementary; and the serious value claimed for it can only be attained in college. At present, aside from giving the student facility with forms and syntax, the subject is an idle waste of good time and better dispositions. We spend 20 per cent of our time in making a semblance of a bauble.

But enough of illustrations of this sort. Talk to men outside of our ranks about the classics. In what are they interested? Textual criticism? verbal statistics? the nature of the subjunctive? hidden quantities? clausulae in Cicero? swear words in Plautus? the Arval Brethren? a potsherd from Anzio? None of these. They seek life, custom, law, story, poem, art—all that can strengthen, enlighten, sweeten, or entertain a mind busied in an active world. Are we to say to such persons, *procul O procul este profani*?

What can we contribute in the several years at our disposal to the formation of the cultured gentleman? Unless we pay heed to this great opportunity and bend our energies to furnish a priceless asset to the man and woman outside of our fold, we shall soon hear the wolves yelping about the palisades behind which we huddle in fancied security. It is purblind arrogance for us to assume any consummate superiority of our studies over others, while we see the numbers that quit our classrooms for some involving even greater mental effort.

I have found two classes of opinion among graduates of college who still advocate classical studies: first, those who look back with fondness upon the drill and discipline of early work—*forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit*; second, those who found in their later studies the awakening sense of literary values. The first class is still of goodly size; the second—*exigui numero, sed bello vivida virtus*. I have met scarcely a man beyond the pale of the teaching order who looks upon the pursuit of almost all that we term "research" as of any value to his culture. I submit that such an experience is significant and minatory. For it is the non-teaching force that will control the destiny of Latin as it has that of Greek. And this is right. Either we must prove our serviceableness to the general life of today, or go to the wall. The day was when Latin

was written and spoken long after it ceased to be the tongue of a people; but that day gave way from its annoying cumbersomeness in the midst of living conditions. So we must be something more than a stumbling-block in the educational highway. We must clear straight paths to definite ends, where profit is to be had and life is to be bettered.

The query has doubtless arisen in some minds as to the concern of a preparatory teacher in the higher questions of aim and method. Well, he is deeply concerned in the ultimate destiny of his labors, in the finished product of the college and the university. Our educational system is a circle. The college weighs our work, and when we need a teacher we weigh the college product. It is increasingly difficult to get good teachers of Latin for secondary schools. No well-disciplined research scholar cares to waste his powers outside the college fence, and no poor one is worth his salt. The devotee of research is not inevitably a lover of youth. We need trained scholars who can still be men.

It is a common retort of the champion of research to the advocate of literature that the latter has nothing tangible to offer; that his words are the idle vaporings of an inane mind. It may be freely admitted that it is easier to transmit a comprehension of most of the matter of research studies than it is to impart an appreciative taste for good literature; and it may possibly be a greater work. Apparently critical scholarship, not discerning taste, is the ultimate aim of our leaders. Aesthetic considerations are too frequently regarded as the effluvia of the retorts wherein only solid metal has worth.

There is a lamentable self-congratulatory feeling among us that when we speak of cultivated people we mean ourselves *par excellence*. I am not so sure that the ranks of our profession contain all that is best among writers, all that is most stimulating among thinkers, or even all the ablest critics of literature, art, or life. Frankly, are we pushing the world along? Have people no right at all to say that we do not touch life as it is today? I am driven to the conviction that this state of things is due largely to the purely technical trend of intensive study; for ability abounds. Have we no motive to keep alive an interest in the classics outside

the limits of our salaried experts? We must realize again that the transmission of mastered knowledge and the cultivation of a consummate taste are the scholar's inseparable tasks. Our students have a holy right to expect that their teachers of the humanities shall exhibit in themselves the cultural fruits of the education which they make bold to implant. They are weary of finicky fussiness, discontent over trifles, triumphs in tiny victories, loss of the forest for the trees.

"But shall we feed our students on mere enthusiasm?" we hear in sarcastic tones. A caustic tongue might reply that the supply of that nutriment isn't glutting the market as yet. No; but it should be possible so to interpret our authors that youths may learn to comprehend and admire *them* for what *they* wrote, not for what we have unearthed in their medium of ideas which the authors never dreamed of, and at which they would stand aghast. Literature cannot be taught by studying something else, and philology is something else. Literary taste is the outcome of literary study, and this taste is a cultural accomplishment of priceless worth to every gentleman. We may not say to the student, "Let there be light!" and trust that there will be a spontaneous illumination of culture within him. He must live in the light if he would share it.

When Christianity was winning the intellect of the world, the same opposition that has confronted us was raised against the dominance of a literature that had its source in a passing faith. Tatian and Tertullian raised their potent voices in denunciation of the pagan literature, as unsuited to the perusal of those whose aim was the nurture of Christian faith. But Clement of Alexandria compared such shrinking from classical writers to the behavior of the comrades of Odysseus, who stopped their ears that they might not hear the Siren song, which they knew they had not the power to withstand. There lies the strength of the classics today. That persuasive song is still ringing in the ears of those who once have hearkened to it and keeps them hovering in view of the enchanted isles of ancient culture.

THE SCHOOLBOY'S DREAM

BY OLIVE SUTHERLAND
Eastern High School, Detroit, Mich.

(A boy is seated at study with a copy of Caesar before him.)

BOY (*sleepily*): "Cum esset Caesar—Caesar—in citeriore Gallia, ita—ita—uti supra demonstravimus crebri ad eum ru-rumores affere—afferebantur—" (*head falls on book*).

(Enter ghost of Caesar. Boy stirs in sleep—stretches—becomes aware of the apparition.)

BOY: Great Caesar's ghost, what's that?

CAESAR: Vocasne me?

BOY (*aside*): That sounds like Latin. Wonder who he is. (*Aloud*) Talk English—this isn't school. Why don't you say something? (*Becoming frightened*) Great Caesar! Who are you anyway?

CAESAR: Dixisti. Sum Caesar quem omnis orbis terrarum maximum Romanum appellavit.

BOY: "Sum Caesar"—wait a minute. Oh! that's easy—"I am Caesar." But say, you don't mean it, do you? You're not really Caesar, the Caesar who wrote this book? Where have you been all this time?

CAESAR: In inferiore terra in hibernis.

BOY (*making a dash for his book*): "In citeriore Gallia in hibernis"—Say, Mr. Caesar, you have two words wrong, and you ought to know, since you wrote it.

CAESAR (*paying no attention to the boy's remark*): Cum in inferiore terra essem crebri ad me rumores afferebantur litterisque item magistrorum certior fiebam omnes pueros puellasque contra meos commentarios coniurare equosque inter se dare.

BOY: Oh, now I've caught on! You didn't fool me this time. If you'd talk book language all the time I'd know what you are driving at, provided you didn't use the words in chapter two, for I haven't looked up those words yet; so of course I don't know

them. But I know what you said this time all right. You said (*speaking slowly and from time to time referring to the book*), "While I was in the lower world frequent rumors were brought to me, and I was also informed by the letters of the teachers, that all the boys and girls were conspiring against my commentaries and were exchanging horses"—horses—horses—ha, ha!—we don't call them horses; we call them "ponies." But I haven't got one, honestly I haven't (*rises from his chair in his excitement*).

CAESAR: Sit—(*Boy falls back into his chair with a thud*).

CAESAR:—mihi negotium ut de his rebus cognoscam.

BOY (*aside*): I thought that was an English word—it came so sudden and emphatic like.

CAESAR: Sis—

BOY (*weakly*): Yes, sir.

CAESAR: —tu auxilio mihi.

BOY (*wildly*): This is the most confusing conversation. My head fairly swims. One minute I hear a real sensible English word, then the next minute some of that tiresome old Latin is tacked on to it so that it might be heathen Chinese for all I know about it.

CAESAR: I take mercy upon you. If you cannot speak my language I shall oblige you by speaking yours. Now, my lad, come tell me—what do you think of my conquests in Gaul, my diplomacy, my generalship, my—

BOY: I don't know anything about those things. I don't have time to look them up. But I'll tell you one thing—I hate this old book of yours. It wouldn't be so bad if it had any sense to it, but what's the use of all those ablatives, datives, subjunctives, purpose clauses, indirect questions, infinitives with accusatives for subjects, all jumbled up together in such a crazy patchwork quilt that it gets upon a fellow's nerves? Say, where could a fellow find out about those conquests of yours? I think I would like to know about them.

CAESAR: In the manner of Cicero, my fellow-country-man, I could exclaim "O tempora! O mores! Haec magistri intellegunt. Discipuli haec vident. Error tamen vivit," and add with feeling, "O miseri commentarii, O miserior Caesar, O miserrimus puer." You read and yet you do not read, for you read without compre-

hending. You make of my work which I had thought would speak to men of plans carefully formed, of leadership unrivaled, of boundless ambition and growing achievement, of fears and hopes and living deeds, a complicated puzzle of words and phrases which at the best but pleases you to solve, yet lacking soul, cold and dead.

BOY: All that may be very true, but a fellow can't do everything. I hate Latin anyway. It's too hard—takes too long to learn. I'm going to drop it next semester. Father said I might.

CAESAR: All failure is divided into three parts, one of which the "Gay-Guy" possesses, the second the "I'll-quit-anians," the third those who in their own language are called "Cant's," but in ours "Dulls." Of all these the Dulls are the bravest because they are the farthest away from the hope and inspiration of success. To which tribe, young man, do you belong? Or do you not scorn to be counted among these barbarians and prefer to claim citizenship in the great city of Victory, whose brave warriors have subdued all the world by living up to the martial watchword, "Veni, vidi, vici"? Answer me.

BOY: For a long time, O Caesar, I have been living in the land of Failure, but I guess I'm tired of it now. I don't like the ways and customs of the folks that live there; so I'm going back to my native city just as soon as I can, and I hope I may some time say as you have said, "I came, I saw, I conquered." But I'm too sleepy now, Mr. Caesar. I'll have to wait till tomorrow morning (*head drops on desk*).

CAESAR: Bene dixisti, puer fortissime. Vale, mi amice, vale. (*Exit Caesar.*)

BOY: What a funny dream, I do declare! But I guess after all I did get a glimmer of the truth. Anyway, I don't think I'll drop Latin yet. (*Looks at his watch.*) Eleven o'clock! Well, no wonder I'm tired—the Land of Nod for me!

[*Written for the Roman Senate, Eastern High School.*]

Notes

Contributions in the form of notes or discussions should be sent to John A. Scott, Northwestern University, Evanston, Ill.

XENOPHON *ANABASIS*, iv. 8. 27

In describing the games held in connection with the sacrifices to Zeus, Heracles, and the other gods at Trapezus, Xenophon says:

καλὴ θάα ἐγένετο· πολλοὶ γὰρ κατέβησαν καὶ ᾗτε θεωμένων τῶν ἑταίρων πολλὴ φιλονικία ἐγίγνετο. . . . ἔνθα πολλὴ κραυγὴ καὶ γέλως καὶ παρακείμεναι ἐγίγνετο.

The MSS have either *ἑταίρων* or *ἐτέρων*. Editors have invariably preferred *ἑταίρων*. Budaeus was the first to suggest *ἑταιρῶν*. In 1857 Cobet repeated the suggestion, and it still stands in Warren's revision (1898) of his edition. Kruger adopted it and it has remained in the subsequent revisions. Sauppe, Gemoll, and Schenkl reject it. Elsewhere it is ignored. It is particularly surprising to find no mention of it in the Oxford and Teubner editions. Under these circumstances it seems worth while to call attention to this well-nigh forgotten emendation which is extremely attractive. Cobet (*Mnemosyne*, VI, 392-93) supports his view as follows: "Non dubito quin verissime emendatum sit *ἑταιρῶν* pro *ἑταίρων*. Praeter quam quod res ipsa ex se ipsa satis est perspicua, animadvertendum est *ἑταίρους* non esse *συστρατιώτας* sed *φίλους* καὶ *συνήθεις*. Itaque quae sit illa causa cur πολλὴ φιλονικία excitata esse dicatur dictu difficile est."

At the banquet given by Seuthes to the Greek officers Xenophon, being somewhat embarrassed because he had no present to offer to his entertainer, offered the services of himself and his companions in arms (vii. 3. 30). The whole speech is cast in a heroic mould, so we are not surprised to find *ἑταῖροι* used in the Homeric sense. In iv. 7. 11, it is used in the sense of chums. *ἑταῖροι* as the equivalent of *συστρατιῶται*, the only meaning that will fit this passage, is not found in the *Anabasis*. In another passage where the stimulating effects of the presence of the army as spectators are mentioned the words *τὸ στράτευμα πᾶν θεώμενον* (iv. 7. 11) are used. This or some similar expression would have been more natural here if indeed it was necessary to mention the presence of the army at all. If, however, we read *ἑταιρῶν* we see at once why πολλὴ φιλονικία ἐγίγνετο. The *ἑταῖραι* who accompanied the army in large numbers were the objects of tender solicitude on the part of the soldiers. On one occasion (iv. 3. 30) a number of soldiers deserted their posts in the face of the enemy to assure themselves of the safety of their female companions.

Many, no doubt, were slaves, like the clever *danseuse* who performed at the banquet in honor of the Paphlagonian envoys. But many free women must have accompanied the troops from Sardis.¹ Rivalries for their favor resulting in personal encounters were not infrequent.² Of necessity the women were present with the army on all occasions. At the ford of the Centrites River (iv. 3. 19) they joined in the war cry. We may be sure that they were interested spectators at the games, and even joined in the *κραυγή καὶ γέλως καὶ παρακείμεναι*.

It is characteristic of Xenophon's literary technique to mention only striking or unusual things in descriptions. Thus in describing the Median wall he mentions the kiln-dried bricks and mortar with which Greeks were not familiar (ii. 4. 12; cf. Gulick, *Life of Ancient Greeks*, 23). Contrast this with his reference to the wrenching of timbers from the houses of a Babylonian village. Xenophon's Greek readers knew how easily this could be done in the case of houses built of sun-dried bricks. Similarly in describing the games held in connection with the Lycian festival he mentions only two things, the handsome prizes, and the presence of Cyrus (i. 2. 10). In the present passage also he selects only the unusual features for mention, the unfavorable place chosen by the master of the games, the participation of slaves and prisoners, the difficulties of horse racing on a steep slope ending in the sea, and the presence of the women. Although in some places in Greece women participated in games as spectators and even as contestants,³ the spectacle of a large number of *ἑταῖραι* at the celebration of the games at Trapezus was sufficiently novel to call for notice.

It may be added that an exactly similar confusion in the text occurs in iv. 3. 30: πολλοὶ γὰρ καὶ τῶν μένειν τεταγμένων ὄχοντο ἐπιμελόμενοι οἱ μὲν ὑποζυγίων, οἱ δὲ σκευῶν, οἱ δ' ἑταιρῶν. In this passage *ἑταιρῶν* suggested by Zeunius has been adopted in preference to the MSS readings *ἑταίρων* and *ἑτέρων*.

ROBERT J. BONNER

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

A FOURTH-CENTURY ODYSSEY

It is a familiar fact that the manuscript tradition of the *Odyssey* is decidedly less full and ancient than that of the *Iliad*. Even before the papyri began to stream out of Egypt into our libraries, the best considerable manuscript of the *Iliad*, the tenth-century Venetus A, was a century earlier than the *Odyssey*'s best, Laurentianus. And the papyri have increased the disparity. Of the

¹ Cf. Plutarch *Alexander* 41 for *ἐλεύθεραι ἑταῖραι*, and the deep interest of a soldier in one of them.

² Cf. v. 8. 4, *περὶ παιδικῶν μαχόμενος*.

³ Gardiner, *Greek Athletic Sports and Festivals*, 47, 239, 387.

literary papyri thus far published, it is true, about one-third are Homeric, but of these fully three-fourths are *Iliad*; the *Odyssey* has fared but poorly at the hands of the excavators.

But a recent publication puts a new face upon the situation. Among the papyri collected by the Earl of Crawford, and purchased ten years ago by the John Rylands Library, of Manchester, is a parchment codex of about 300 A.D., which, when complete, contained the whole *Odyssey*. Of its original 207 leaves, parts of 79 are preserved, many of them substantially complete. The text occupies nearly one-half of Dr. Hunt's new volume of Rylands' Papyri (1911), and includes parts of eleven books, xii-xv and xviii-xxiv. While the original scribe used the dieresis and the apostrophe, breathings, accents, and punctuation have been introduced by a later hand. The quires were numbered, and the books lettered. While books i-xi are wholly absent, some of the later books are well preserved; from xxi. 91 to the end of xxiv not a line has been wholly lost. The importance of this for the vexed question of order is evident. A number of lines are omitted: xiv. 154; xx. 197; xxi. 65, 66, 109, 219, 220, 276, 291, 292 (these two afterward supplied above the column), 308; xxii. 43, 174; xxiii. 48, 127, 128, 320; xxiv. 79, 121, 143, 277, 480. The text shows some peculiar ("singular") readings and in those otherwise supported Dr. Hunt finds no decided affinity with any known manuscript or group of manuscripts. Its important contribution to the textual materials for the *Odyssey* tends, as such textual accessions usually do, in some respects to complicate the evidence.

In the work of the corrector, some novel principles of accentuation are reflected. At all events, he sometimes combines ancient and modern systems, as in *Διὸς τρεῖς, χεῖροι, γῆμέτρεις*, xxii. 136, 148, 166. Indeed, both textually and paleographically, the new Rylands *Odyssey*, one of the oldest parchment codices in existence, is full of interest, and merits the close attention of classical students.

EDGAR J. GOODSPEED

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Practice and Prospect

Edited by J. J. SCHLICHER

DOCTORS' DISSERTATIONS IN THE CLASSICS, 1910-11

Below is given a list of those who received the degree of Doctor of Philosophy from American institutions in Greek, Latin, and allied subjects during the last school year, together with the titles of their dissertations:

Boston University

1. BONNER, ARTHUR, "Elements of Platonism in English Poetry from Chaucer to Browning."

Bryn Mawr College

2. COULTER, CORNELIA C., "Rectractatio in the Ambrosian and Palatine Recensions of Plautus." Published in the "Bryn Mawr Monograph Series."

Columbia University

3. CHICKERING, EDWARD CONNER, "An Introduction to Octavia Praetexta" (Marion Press, Jamaica, N.Y.).

Cornell University

4. BENNETT, CHARLES E., "The Use of Connecting Negatives with Subjunctives, Optatives, and Imperatives in Latin." Not yet published.

Harvard University

5. LITCHFIELD, HENRY WHEATLAND, "Quibus virtutum vitiorumque moralium exemplis ex suorum annalibus sumptis scriptores Latini antiqui usi sint." Brief summary published in *Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.* XXII, 181 ff.

6. ROBINSON, DWIGHT NELSON, "Quibus temporibus religiones ab Oriente ortae et Romae et in provinciis Romanis floruerint desierintque." Brief summary in *Harvard Studies in Class. Phil.* XXII, 181 ff.

Johns Hopkins University

7. FOX, W. SHERWOOD, "Unpublished Tabellae Defixionum in the Johns Hopkins Museum." Preliminary account in *Johns Hopkins Univ. Circular*, 1910, No. 6, pp. 7-10.

Princeton University

8. ALEXANDER BERTAL LEIGH, "The Early Kings of Lydia." Soon to be published.

9. DURHAM, DONALD BLYTHE, "The Diction of Menander considered in Relation to the κούνη."

10. HAILE, CHARLES HENRY, "The Clown in Greek Literature after Aristophanes." In press.

University of California

11. DEUTSCH, M. E., "Notes on the Text of the Corpus Tibullianum." To be published in the *Cal. Publ. Class. Phil.*

University of Chicago

12. BROWN, HAZEL LOUISE, "The Written and Spoken Speech Controversy."

13. CALHOUN, GEORGE MILLER, "Athenian Clubs in Politics and Litigation."

14. KEITH, ARTHUR LESLIE, "The Development of Simile and Metaphor from Homer to Euripides."

15. ROBBINS, FRANK EGGLESTON, "Hexaemeral Literature."

University of Pennsylvania

16. MCCARTNEY, EUGENE STOCK, "Figurative Uses of Animal Names in Latin and Their Application to Military Devices." New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa.

17. THOMPSON, CLARA LOUISE, "Taedium Vitae in Latin Sepulchral Inscriptions." New Era Printing Co., Lancaster, Pa.

University of Wisconsin

18. BRANDT, JOSEPH G., "A Contribution to the History of the Third Augustan Legion, with Special Reference to Religion."

19. HOOTON, ERNEST A., "The Evolution of Literary Art in Pre-Hellenic Rome."

Yale University

20. NYE, IRENE, "Sentence Connection as Illustrated in Certain Portions of Livy's History." To be published.

21. WESTON, ARTHUR HAROLD, "A Study in Satirical Literature in Post-Juvenalian Latin." To be published.

Current Events

Edited by Clarence W. Gleason, Volkmann School, Boston, Mass., for the territory covered by the Association of New England and the Atlantic States; Daniel W. Lothman, East High School, Cleveland, Ohio, for the Middle States, west to the Mississippi River; Walter Miller, University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., for the southern states; and by Frederick C. Eastman, the University of Iowa, Iowa City, Ia., for the territory west of the Mississippi, exclusive of Louisiana and Texas. This department will present everything that is properly news—occurrences from month to month, meetings, changes in faculties, performances of various kinds, etc. All news items should be sent to the associate editors named above.

Ohio

Cincinnati.—The Latin Section of the Central Ohio Teachers' Association which met in Cincinnati, Ohio, Friday and Saturday, November 10 and 11, held its meeting at Woodward High School on Friday afternoon.

The program follows: Conductor, Superintendent Henry Hartman, Marion, Ohio; "Latin Composition," Dr. Arthur W. Hodgman, of Ohio State University; "Importance of Historical Setting in Teaching Latin," Laura G. Wagner, Delaware High School; "How to Popularize Latin," Bertha Winch, Steele High School, Dayton; "Value of Latin in Our Course of Study," Anna Fife, Marion High School; "Nature in the *Aeneid*," Lulu Cumback, Springfield High School; "What Purposes Does High-School Latin Serve?" M. J. Flannery, Hamilton High School; "The Comparison of the *Aeneid* as an Epic of Patriotism with Shakespeare's *Henry Fifth*," Harriet R. Kirby, North High School, Columbus; "Some Prime Objects in Teaching Cicero," Carrie B. Allen, Newark High School.

Columbus.—The third year of the Columbus Latin Club opened auspiciously on November 25, with a dinner at the Hotel Southern. Thirty-five assembled. Professor Benjamin L. D'Ooge was the guest of honor. Place cards were provided reproducing in India ink small classical figures with a Latin quotation, adapted from D'Ooge's *Latin for Beginners*. The social hour spent about the festal board proved a happy way of bringing together congenial spirits who follow the daily round in places quite widely separated.

In an address upon "Methods of First-Year Latin," Professor D'Ooge traced in an interesting and highly suggestive manner the development of the attractive modern textbooks and methods of teaching, creating in his listeners renewed enthusiasm for their profession.

Following brief remarks by Professors S. C. Derby, of Ohio State University, the discussion was led by Miss Watters, of East High, Miss Reel, of Indianola Junior High, and Dr. Hodgman, of Ohio State. Miss Feill (South High) presided.

This club has resulted in much pleasure and great profit to its members.

Wisconsin

At the *Latin Conference of the Wisconsin State Teachers' Association*, on November 10, the following papers were read: "What is Essential to First-Year Work in Subject-Matter and Method of Teaching?" Miss Leta M. Wilson, High School, Madison; Discussion opened by Mr. Wallace Reiss, South Division High School, Milwaukee; "Devices in the Teaching of Latin," Miss Lucia E. Danforth, Platteville Normal School; Discussion opened by Mr. Donald Frank, East Division High School, Milwaukee. The meeting of the conference was the most successful that has even been held, and the papers were suggestive and helpful. Beginning with this year a closer acquaintance will be formed by means of a card catalogue kept by the secretary, containing the names and addresses of teachers who attend. The president is Miss Lucia Danforth, Platteville Normal School; the secretary-treasurer, Wallace Reiss, South Division High School, Milwaukee.

Iowa

The Latin Teachers' Round Table of the State Teachers' Association on November 10 was well attended. Subjects of papers were "The Rightful Place of Latin in Our Present Educational System," by Professor F. H. Potter, of the State University; and "The Maintenance of Latin in Its Rightful Place," by Lillian E. Dimmitt, of Morningside College.

The Auxiliary Section of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South, for which a place has been given on the regular program for several years, held an interesting session. A large number of the Latin Round Table are members of the larger association. The interests of the association were presented by Professor Smiley, vice-president for Iowa, and several enthusiastic voluntary addresses were made in its favor. Twenty-one new members were added to the association at this meeting.

The Iowa State Hellenic Society held its annual meeting on November 10 in connection with the meeting of the State Teachers' Association. The society voted to hold its spring meeting in May at Iowa City. A committee was appointed to draft a communication concerning Greek, to be mailed later in the year, to Freshmen of all colleges in the state. President J. H. T. Main, of Grinnell, is the president of the society.

Prior to the meeting of the Hellenic Society, the Greek Round Table held its session. The papers and addresses were presented by persons not professionally interested in Greek. President John G. Bowman, president of the State University, Professor R. B. McLennon, professor of mathematics, Grinnell College, and Colonel Alonzo Abernethy, once president of the old University of Chicago, made addresses. The meeting was of a very encouraging nature.

Kansas

The usual *Classical Round Table* was held in connection with the State Teachers' Association, on November 10. The attendance was unusually

large, a speaker from outside the state having been for the first time provided by the general management. This was Professor Benjamin D'Ooge, who gave a paper on "The Classical Outlook," and later conducted a question-box exercise.

The meeting of the Classical Association of Kansas and Missouri will be held in the spring.

Colorado

The following program was furnished by the *Classical Section of the Colorado Teachers' Association* on November 28: "What the Year's Work in Caesar Should Do for a Pupil," H. M. Barrett, Pueblo; "The Trojan Women of Euripides, Translated by Gilbert Murray," Mrs. L. C. Greenlee, Denver; "Latin as an Aid to English," Miss Anna Lister, Denver; Discussion, Rev. William O'Ryan, Denver; W. H. Smiley, Denver; Dr. M. F. Libby, University of Colorado. The classics were well represented in the various sections of the general program.

Washington

Seattle.—The recently organized Classical Association of the Pacific Northwest in its second session were the guests of the University of Washington, at Seattle, December 29 and 30, holding its meetings in conjunction with the Philological Society of Washington. All teachers in the classics and all persons interested in classical studies in the states of Oregon and Washington were invited to attend and participate.

Florida

The Classical Association of the State of Florida held its second annual conference at Jacksonville, December 28, in connection with the State Educational Association, of which it is a recognized department. All the members are members also of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. The program was as follows: I, "Can Florida Afford to Neglect the Classics?" Clarence E. Boyd, Florida State College for Women; II, Symposium, "Greek and Latin in Florida"; (1) "The Present Status of Classical Study in Our Universities and Colleges," James N. Anderson, University of Florida, and Edmund M. Hyde, Rollins College; (2) "The Present Status of Classical Study in Our High Schools," W. M. Holloway, state superintendent of schools, and W. N. Sheats, Lakeland; (3) "The Classical Course in the Curriculum of the Modern College," Nathaniel M. Salley, Florida State College for Women, and Charles S. Farris, John B. Stetson University; (4) "The Classical Course in the Curriculum of the Modern High School," M. J. Okerlund, Perry, and B. B. Lane, Starke.

The officers are C. E. Boyd, Florida State College, president; W. N. Sheats, Lakeland, vice-president; Miss Lucile Patton, New Smyrna, secretary.

Recent Books

Foreign books in this list may be obtained of Lemcke & Buechner, 30-32 West 27th St., New York City; G. E. Stechert & Co., 151-55 West 25th St., New York City.

- AESCHYLUS. *The Agamemnon*. The Greek Text with English Verse Translation. By Sixth Form Boys of Bradfield College. London: Frowde, 1911. 1s. 6d.
- BARSS, J. E. *Third Year Latin for Sight Reading; Selections from Sallust and Cicero*. New York: Amer. Book Co., 1911. Pp. 123. \$0.40.
- BELZNER, E. *Homerische Probleme*. I. Die kulturellen Verhältnisse der *Odyssee* als kritische Instanz. Mit einem Nachwort (Aristarchea) von A. Römer. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911. Pp. vi+201. M. 5.
- BROWN, A. C. B. *Ovid. Selections, Heroic and Elegiac*. Oxford: University Press, 1911. Pp. 40. \$0.40.
- CARTER, J. B. *The Religious Life of Ancient Rome*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1911. Pp. viii+297. \$2.00.
- COTTERILL, H. B. *Homer's Odyssey*. A new line for line translation in the meter of the original. London: Harrap & Co., 1911. Pp. 360. 21s.
- DANA, C. L. and J. C. *Quintus Horatius Flaccus*. The Letters of Horace Presented to Modern Readers. Woodstock, Vt.: The Elm Tree Press, 1911. Pp. 87. \$3.00.
- DUFF, J. D. *An Easy Selection from Cicero's Correspondence*. (Pitt Press Series.) London: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. vi+126. \$0.45.
- FERGUSON, W. S. *Hellenistic Athens*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xviii+487. \$4.00.
- FERRERO, G. *The Women of the Caesars*. New York: Century Co., 1911. Pp. x+337. \$2.00.
- FRAZER, J. G. *The Golden Bough*. 3d ed. Part III. The Dying God. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xii+305. \$3.25.
- HAVET, L. *Manuel de critique verbale appliquée aux textes latins*. Paris: Hachette, 1911. Pp. viii+481. Fr. 50.
- LICHTENBERG, R. v. *Die ägäische Kultur*. Leipzig: Quelle und Meyer, 1911. Pp. 160. M. 1.
- MACDONALD, G. *The Roman Wall in Scotland*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xv+413. \$4.50.
- MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. *The Poetics of Aristotle*. Translated from the Greek into English and from Arabic into Latin. With revised text, introd., etc. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1911. Pp. xix+336. 10s. 6d.
- PECK, H. T. *A History of Classical Philology*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xii+491. \$2.00.
- PLATNER, S. B. *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*. 2d ed. enlarged. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1911. Pp. 552. \$3.00.
- STOBART, J. C. *The Glory That Was Greece*. A Survey of Hellenic Culture and Civilization. Philadelphia: Lippincott, 1911. Pp. xxiii+289. \$7.50.
- WALTERS, H. B. *The Art of the Romans*. New York: Macmillan, 1911. Pp. xvi+185. \$5.00.